



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mitted to no critical examination ; old and new, good and bad, are lumped together. There are some serious omissions in the bibliography, but many good books do appear there, and it is only to be regretted that these do not take a more prominent place in the body of the book.

The foot-notes which indicate (not always correctly), the authorities for statements in the text, betray an astonishing lack of critical perception on the part of the author. Apparently all books are to him equally trustworthy. A favorite authority for facts in any period of history is Cantù, *Storia Universale*, Turin, 1857, a compilation which was not considered reliable at the time when it was written, though the standard for such books was much lower than it is to-day. Even old Rollin figures among the authorities in the notes, though his name is decently omitted from the bibliography to make place for the more imposing Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Ammianus Marcellinus. For conditions in ancient Greece we are referred to *The Wealth of Nations*, for the causes of the decline of the Dutch East India Company to Miss Scidmore's *Java*; these are both of them excellent books, but they are hardly satisfactory for the purpose in hand. Good books are cited in the notes, but much oftener apparently than they were used by the author. Thus the name of Heyd's *Geschichte des Levantehandels*, the great secondary authority for Italian settlements in the East, appears not infrequently in the section devoted to medieval colonization, but little use is made of the valuable material in the book, and the author quotes about as much of it indirectly from Adams's *Civilization* as he does from the original.

There seems no need to discuss the contents of the book in detail, or to point out its errors in fact. The first part of Volume I., devoted to colonization in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, is especially poor. The modern period is better treated and as the history approaches the present day it constantly improves. In writing the history of recent events Mr. Morris shows a command of facts and a sense of proportion which are missing in the greater part of his work. It is a pity that he dissipated his energies over so broad a field.

The book will probably be well received by the public, for its subject is popular now and in general its style is agreeable, but it can make no claim to the attention of the student or the scholar.

CLIVE DAY.

Sesostris. Von KURT SETHE. ["Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Alterthumskunde Aegyptens," II. 1.] (Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1900. Pp. 24.)

OF all the puppets which have been made to dance upon the stage of Egyptian history in response to Greek imagination, the most remarkable is that of Sesostris. The readers of this journal are too familiar with the fabulous achievements attributed to him by Herodotus, Diodorus, and all the rest, to require even a reference to them here. The question of

who and what was the real hero who inspired this gradual accumulation of traditions, dilating at last into the dominant figure of Egyptian, if not indeed of all ancient Oriental history, has always been of the greatest interest. How fascinating would be the Alexander romance if we did not know to whom it refers! The subject has been little touched since the days of Lepsius and De Rougé; with the exception of the careful Meyer all the later histories follow Champollion and Lepsius, who, on the flimsiest evidence, identified Sesostris with Ramses II. We all remember when in 1881 the world was startled by the announcement that the mummy of *Sesostris* had been discovered and lay in state at Cairo. His face and figure have since become more familiar to the layman than those of any other Pharaoh.

Professor Sethe has exhaustively examined in the above essay all the classical references to Sesostris and shows clearly that his identification with Ramses II. is entirely gratuitous, for neither: (1) his name, (2) his date, nor (3) his achievements suggest, much less permit such identification. On the other hand Sethe shows, on the basis of name, date and achievements, that, as Manetho has already indicated, Sesostris was Usertesen I. of the Twelfth Dynasty, a king some 700 years older than Ramses II. of the Nineteenth Dynasty. The writer well remembers the day in the Berlin Museum, when Sethe came in all aglow with the enthusiasm of discovery. He had been studying the coffin of a certain "Sebek-sen;" this man's name is composed of two parts; "Sebek" the name of a crocodile god, and "sen" meaning "likeness." The Egyptians in their exaggerated reverence for their divinities always wrote the god's name first in such a compound as the above, although they pronounced it last, thus: "Sen-Sebek" meaning "likeness of Sebek." It had flashed upon Sethe that "*Usertesen*" was another such inversion and that the final "*sen*" should be read first, thus: "*Sen-Usret*" or properly vocalized "*Sen-Wosret*" (in hieroglyphics *Sn-wsrt*).¹ Any one who knows how far removed from the hieroglyphic are the forms of Egyptian proper names transmitted to us by the Greeks, will immediately see that Sesostris is a very natural corruption of Senwosret, and vastly nearer the hieroglyphic than the name of Ramses II. (*Wsr-m't-R'*), long ago accepted without difficulty by the historians. With this observation of Sethe's, the mighty Sesostris of the Greeks suddenly becomes more than legend, and takes a place in authentic history. The question of *name* is thus reduced to the following equations:

1. In Manetho: the old Usertesen I. = Sesostris.
2. On monuments: the old " " = Senwosret I.
3. Therefore Manetho's "Sesostris" = monumental "Senwosret I."

In *date* Sethe shows that practically all the classic sources place Sesostris far earlier than Ramses II., and in most cases at a time well suiting Senwosret I.

The question of career and achievements is too large to be treated here, but one further point it is essential to note. In harmony with the

¹ This had not been noticed before because Wosret is not a well-known deity.

Greek traditions of Sesostris, Senwosret I. is shown by the monuments to have been the first Egyptian conqueror of Nubia. Sethe (p. 17) places the southern limit of his conquest at Wadi Halfa, just below the second cataract, his triumphal tablet¹ having been found at that place. But it was at least 40 miles further south than this, for the list of conquered districts on the above tablet contains the name Sha't (*Š't*). Now Sha't is mentioned some 500 years later by Thutmose (Thotmes) III. on the walls of his temple at Kummeh (40 miles above Wadi Halfa) as the place where the stone for this temple was obtained. Hence Sha't is in the vicinity of this temple, and of course above it on the river.² As Kummeh on the east shore, and its pendant fort on the west shore, formed the extreme southern frontier of Nubia afterward, permanently maintained by Senwosret I.'s family (the Twelfth Dynasty), the interesting fact appears that he himself conquered to the extreme limit all the territory afterward held by his dynasty. This fact is quite sufficient to account for the initial fame of his achievements, which ultimately made him the hero of tradition, absorbing not merely the reputations of the other Senwosrets of his dynasty, but also much of the glory of the Asiatic conquests which culminated 500 years later.

Sethe's results therefore add not a little lustre to the name of Senwosret I., the conqueror of Nubia, nearly 2000 B. C., and lend new dignity to the great Twelfth Dynasty. He is also to be congratulated on a brilliant and solid contribution to the study of Greek sources, and he has incidentally again illustrated how nearly useless for early Egyptian history such sources are, unless controlled by contemporary monuments.

JAMES HENRY BREASTED.

The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity. By JAMES VERNON BARTLET, M.A., Mansfield College, Oxford. [Ten Epochs of Church History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xlv, 542.)

HISTORIES of the Apostolic Age of the Christian Church vary somewhat painfully with the country in which they are written. Weizsäcker in Germany, McGiffert in America, Bartlet in England present diverse pictures according to their measure of scientific spirit and their critical judgments as to the date and value of the sources. The comfort which perplexed students have felt in the growing consensus of German critics respecting the chronology of early Christian documents will be disturbed by this work of Professor Bartlet, whose canon of apostolicity is more confident even than that of the early Church, and whose chronological distribution of the documents is sadly at variance with modern German and

¹ The writer is about to publish the first complete copy of this tablet in the next number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, London. ("The Wadi Halfa Stela of Senwosret I.")

² The second cataract extends below the temple, hence the Sha't quarries must have been *above* the temple, for it is impossible to drag stone boats *up* the cataract.